



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

CHAMBERLAIN'S 'FOUNDATIONS OF THE  
NINETEENTH CENTURY' AND  
THE CLAIMS OF JUDAISM\*

BY SAMUEL SCHULMAN, New York City.

THIS book is a magnificent project, but is vitiated from the start by the author's forgetting his own observation that 'nothing is more dangerous than to attempt to construct history from a single principle' (vol. II, p. 372). While his whole work is a contradiction of this, since it turns around the Germanic race as the centre of Western civilization and culture, yet we are not surprised by this naïve statement. I find Chamberlain an author most fertile in contradictions. And indeed, no man can write twelve hundred pages crammed with word-pictures and reflections upon the most important interests of humanity, and all this to maintain a preconceived thesis, without involving himself in endless contradictions. Mr. Chamberlain shows, as every human being proves, that there is something greater even than personality, and that is truth, which often coerces a man to speak it, in spite of himself. That is why we Jews, whom he hates so much, do not worship personality, though we well recognize its importance as a creative force

\* *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century.* By HOUSTON STEWART CHAMBERLAIN. A translation from the German by JOHN LEES, M.A., D.Litt. (Edin.), with an introduction by Lord REDESDALE, G.C.V.O., K.C.B., &c., in two volumes. New York: JOHN LANE COMPANY, 1913. Volume I, cii + 578 pages. Volume II, vii + 580 pages.

in history, but rather worship God, who is truth, superior to all personality. Thus, even Chamberlain, dozens of times, unintentionally, when off his guard, when he forgets his thesis and lets truth speak impersonally through him, brings tributes to Jew and Judaism, which are the very opposites of what he says when he is trying to make out his case.

In order to understand a book, one must read it with sympathy and place himself provisionally at the author's standpoint and criticize him from that standpoint. And this is what I intend to do. His work is very artistic, but is a poor philosophy of history, which though not so called, it practically aims to be. It is a unified creation, whose beauty is marred by a hatred of everything non-Aryan and non-Germanic, but above all, of everything Jewish. And hence, the result is the most subjective of books, most stimulating to a mature mind and of great danger for a young man. For the Jew who knows nothing of his people and his religion at first hand through his own thought and life, this book is a treacherous snare. For one whose sacred function it is to interpret the soul of Israel, it is a challenge of joyous combat. It is the Bible of Germanic fanaticism and European anti-Semitism. I do not object to Chamberlain's making the Germanic race (which means for him Celts, Teutons, and Slavs, the Northern peoples of Europe) the centre of Western history and of European civilization and culture, if he so pleases. That makes the strength of the book as an artistic work. The artist is, above all, a co-ordinating, interpreting, shaping and creative personality, and Chamberlain is a strong personality. If I could write such a book, I would make the Jew the centre of history, the creator of its

culture. In so far as, to speak with Chamberlain, religion and ethics are the very constituents of culture, as distinguished from civilization and knowledge in that tripartite division of the elements of social life, which the author makes in the second part of his work, and if culture is the highest and most creative and most individual thing for personality and race, then I could make out quite a claim for the creative and fructifying influence of Jewish genius in history. When some of our *fin de siècle* Jewish sentimentalists talk of Jewish culture as something different from, as something that can be separated from, Jewish religiosity, they talk of what is impossible. Jewish religion is the Jew's distinctive culture. Chamberlain's conception of culture is correct. So I say, I too could make the Jew the centre of history, as he makes the Teuton, and before him, the Aryan or Hellene, Hindu, and Roman. And I could do this without despoiling any other race of its merits and contributions to human progress. I would need only to remind myself of that fragment of ancient Hebrew poetry put into the mouth of Noah, which makes him say, 'May God enlarge Japhet and may He dwell in the tents of Shem'. The consciousness of Jewish individuality and worth did not imply the diminution of recognition of non-Jewish genius. What I object to in Chamberlain is the disastrous result which follows from his deliberate under-valuation and rejection of everything that is not Aryan or Germanic, and which especially prevents him from understanding, nay, makes him unwilling to grasp, the spirit of Judaism. But he dare not do justice to Judaism. If he did, it would destroy his main thesis. The very exaltation of the sufficiency of the Aryan and the Teuton implies the deliberate degradation of the Jew, except where truth

escapes him unawares. For if he once granted what the world has hitherto held, that the Jew is, *par excellence*, the people with a religious genius, and if, as he says, culture, whose constituent is religion, is superior to civilization, then he would have to grant the excellence of the equipment of the Jewish genius and Europe's dependence upon it for its culture. And that is what in his rôle of a man who would keep the 'alien Asiatic people' far from himself, he cannot do. And here we reach the very heart and spirit of the book, its motive and method. The heart and motive are for me given in the remarkable passage on p. 258 of the second volume. He says: 'In Jesus Christ absolute religious genius had entered the world.' 'No one is so well adapted to hear this divine voice as the Teuton.' 'And yet the Gospel disappeared and the great voice is silent.' Chamberlain is here speaking towards the end of the book, after he had developed his main theme, of the corruption of the Christianity of Christ. Why? He tells us: 'For the children of the chaos will not abandon the sacrifice by proxy, which the better spirits among the Hellenes and the Hindus had long ago rejected and which the pre-eminent Prophets of the Jews had centuries ago laughed out of court.' Even the Reformation does not cast it off. He very shrewdly says: 'And this throws the preponderance of the importance of the Reformation into a purely political sphere.' He adds in a note: 'Even Luther (although he laid stress on faith) teaches the doctrine that even the unbeliever breaks with his teeth the body of Christ' when he partakes of the Lord's Supper. Evidently nothing in organized Christianity, as it exists to-day, satisfies him. He needs a new religion. Why does not some Teuton create it for him? He concludes this line of thought by

saying: 'In the want of a true religion that has sprung from and is compatible with our own individuality (he means evidently, Christ's teaching, as echoed in Teutonic hearts), I see the greatest danger for the Teuton.' For him, therefore, the only shortcoming and weakness of the Teuton, and therefore the danger for him, is his inability to create religiously. And Jesus is for him the 'absolute religious genius' whose gospel the Teuton, when genuine and uncorrupted, has always understood. Therefore, the Teuton, we would say, is for culture, in great measure, dependent upon the Jewish race. But Chamberlain turns away in horror, all through the book, from the thought that there could be anything in common between a Germanic and a Jewish spirit. Therefore, he does something which gives us the spirit and method of his whole book. It is pathetic to see this man, in the depths of his soul, attracted by the personality of Jesus, finding absolute religion in his gospel, in a word, the German at the feet of a son of Israel, and yet, all the time, loathing the Semitic race and the Jew his possible neighbour, competitor and brother in culture. He therefore perpetrates the third chapter of his book, whose spirit and method determine the purpose of the whole. In this chapter, he tells us, speaking of Palestine, at the time of the birth of Jesus: 'Only one race at that time was pure—the Jewish. That Jesus Christ did not belong to it is certain.' 'Every further statement is hypothetical.' This is the act of a fanatic who lays down a dogma, because the salvation of his whole theory, upon which he builds his book, is dependent upon it. It is a certainty for him, but it is not the act of a fair, historical writer who only seeks truth and must find that he has no facts with which to refute a universal tradition. Of course,

as we shall see, such dogmatism involves him in a mesh of contradictions. But what we must note here is the psychology of the author's work. Jesus *must* not be a Jew, and the Jew on his hypothesis *must* be the most irreligious, unmystical, rationalistic, materialistic, slavish soul, and what-not amongst men, so that he prove the very foil and contrast to the man who, it is believed, brought salvation to the world, to the 'absolute religious genius'. It is, after all, an old method. The theologians made Judaism a caricature in order to exalt the divinity of Jesus. Now the race theorists, borrowing the information from the theologians, and copying their methods, echo and add to their misrepresentation of Judaism and make their own original contribution of the statement that, by race, Jesus was not a Jew at all.

Chamberlain operates with certain leading ideas. He emphasizes the importance of race, nation, personality, the creative idea in history. He brings out profoundly the significance of religion for culture. He distinguishes culture from civilization, from the 'anonymous forces'. He calls attention to the dependence of human culture upon the leading personalities—Plato, Kant, Goethe, and so forth. With all of this one may sympathize, though it will be necessary to say something to supplement and modify some of these conceptions. And yet he has created a distorted picture of the development of humanity. His greatest service is to have brought out in a popular work the intimate relation between Hindu religion and mythology, and the work of the other races of the so-called Aryan group. His greatest defect is to have turned a philosophy of history into a veritable crusade against the non-Germanic world. I use the word 'crusade' advisedly, for the word

in not antipathetic to Chamberlain. He has an idea that the extension of Roman power over the world was not the result of the spirit of conquest, but rather of Rome's desire to protect itself, to make itself a home inviolate, to safeguard its individuality. And so, from a city, Rome became, in self-defence, a world empire. Thus, he would intimate, it is the duty of the Germanic race to extend its power over the world, not for the sake of conquering, but to prevent its being contaminated through mixture, and destroyed through weakness. In a word, to protect its own individuality. For the thesis is: European culture depends entirely upon the independence of the Germanic race, and the non-Germanic world, where it interferes, must be put down. His style is neither rhetorical nor flowery, nor terse and rugged. It is the intellectual eloquence of an earnest, impassioned soul. His book stimulates and challenges. Sometimes it disgusts. It never bores and always sets to thinking. It is the offering of a brilliant mind who has assimilated the knowledge and culture of Europe, but according to Jewish law, it cannot be accepted on the altar of truth, because it is the gift of a mind prostituted by a colossal prejudice and a boundless race antipathy.

The scope of the work is indicated in the title. Here is the nineteenth century, with its great controversies dividing men into Christians and Jews, into Protestants and Catholics, into individualists and socialists, into racialists and humanitarians, into the vindicators of the principle of nationality as against the upholders of universal empire,—an idea inherited from Rome and incorporated in the Roman Catholic Church,—into materialists and idealists, into glorifiers of the bigness of our civilization with its steam, electricity, machinery, &c., and prophets of individual



culture and artistic personality which such civilization tends to overawe and level ; into universal democracies, dominated by rule of majorities and great ideas which should rule men ; into European powers that reach out to the ends of the earth, and non-European races, who are becoming conscious of their individualities, their right to live and develop. Here is this century,—how shall I, a thinking man, take my place in it with respect to these controversies ? In this sentence, I attempt to summarize the task of the book. It will show how crammed such a book must be with opinions on science, art, religion, philosophy, politics, social economy, anthropology, and much more. It is a tremendous summary of the achievements of the human spirit, teeming with information and misinformation, scintillating with brilliant *aperçus* and bristling with the meanest kinds of slurs and insults for the Jew. It is a powerful work, which calls for a book to answer its misstatements and false theories.

To the question what is struggling in the hearts of men of the nineteenth century, with certain blood in their veins, with certain *plis de pensée*, determined by race, he gives the answer in his book. We must inquire into the foundations of this century. He does not describe the century itself, but analyses the factors which go to make it up. This manner of treating the subject is, in my opinion, not merely governed by methodological considerations, but is a question of utility as determined by his thesis. If he had examined the nineteenth century in detail, he would have been compelled to admit the great service which Jewish ability gave all along the line in this century of Jewish emancipation in the Western World. We must inquire, he holds, what we have inherited, who we are, and we must become

conscious of the fight which had been waged for that heritage in the past. Chamberlain believes only ideas have power in history. Ideas are expressed clearly in personalities of pure race. Only pure races are creative. Race individuality is guarded by nationality, and its greatest foe is mixture of races of the wrong kind, which produces hybridism, mestizos on the one hand, and on the other hand the universal world empire, which would level men and blot out their individualities by universal law, order, power, authority, and dogma. Characterless mongrel races lent themselves to the forming of the later Roman empire, where Syrian and African mestizos, no longer pure Roman, sat on the throne, and to the establishment of the world power of the Roman Church. If Chamberlain can be said to hate anything more than the Jews, it is the Roman Catholic Church. Great geniuses, creative originators are always the products, he holds, of a nation of pure race. Culture is not the product of humanity, but of particular races and particular men. And only these can be said to progress or degenerate. He does not believe in the idea of general progress. There exists for him no humanity. European culture is the product of a particular race, the Germanic race, in the large wide sense mentioned above. And the struggle has been to save the heritage, with which Western history begins, from the corruption brought about by its entering a hybrid mixture, and the elimination from that mixture of the Semitic, Jewish, and mestizo elements. This elimination is finally accomplished by the Teutons. History begins for him only with Jesus. He rejects the terms 'Middle Ages and Renaissance'. What is called renaissance was rather a real-birth of the Germanic spirit. 500 and 1500 are for him most important dates. The

thirteenth century is the decisive century. A century rich indeed in the most variegated activities in science, art, industry, discovery, state building, and religion. It is only influenced by the Semitic element in so far as it must fight it. The victory seems, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, to have been won by Rome, which is all powerful. But whereas the struggle will continue in the individual breast, because of conflicting tendencies, things have been clarified by this time. The Teutonic race becomes conscious of itself and the victory is really for it. He, therefore, divides his work into two parts: the first part consisting of eight chapters, devoted to the heritage, the heirs, and the struggle in Religion and the State, from pages 1 to 1,200, which really ends the book, according to its plan, and the second part, the ninth chapter, devoted to a description of what Teutons, when clarified and emancipated from Rome, that was the organizer of the chaos of mixed races and the inheritance of Semitic chronology and history, are at last able to accomplish. Christianity is for him a hybrid. The Teuton's curse was that he thus inherited it. This is briefly the gist of Chamberlain's historical construction.

The Western World inherits in the beginning from Greece Hellenic art and philosophy, but of the Greeks themselves he has no high opinion. They were 'fickle, faithless'. Their leaders run away to the enemy. 'No being is more immoderate than the Hellene, the preacher of moderation (*sophrosune*) and the golden mean.' But it inherits from the Greek also things he does not like, scholasticism, rationalism, superstition, mysteries, and the soul-cult. And these things come afterwards to be shaped into Christian dogmas. From Rome we inherit law, the idea of the state, family, love of country. He is enraptured

with Roman law, and in his enthusiasm he says in a note the following: (By the way, his most hateful things against the Jews, such as impugning the honesty of Moses Mendelssohn, treating with contempt Spinoza, insulting the memory of Renan by accusing him of having been in his latter years in the pay of the Alliance Israelite, casting a slur upon Jewish scholars, and saying that the time will come when German socialists will tell Karl Marx to go and busy himself with his own people—all these things which show the spirit of the man, are in the form of notes). He says, it is a question whether 'in Teutonic countries, men of Jewish race should be appointed judges, whether they really understand and feel the law which they use so masterfully'. Here is the historian in the rôle of the political anti-Semite! Chamberlain praises the Roman law because it was the creation of a people that fulfilled the two conditions necessary for its making. It had great moral character and acute intelligence. Has it ever occurred to our author that the Jewish people, with its tremendous ethical passion, with its high moral ideals, with its respect and love for the family, with its inculcation of practical virtues and, at the same time, with its acute intelligence, with its keen analytical powers, were just a people to create legal conceptions and a great body of law? And yet, this philosopher of history does not even mention the fact that Talmudic law might well take its place beside Roman law. And perhaps the intelligence of a people disciplined by Talmudic law makes it very easy for representatives of that people to become masters in any other law. And here, I would venture, as a layman, to suggest a thought which may be right or wrong, that if comparisons are to be made, perhaps the genius of the Jewish law, based on the rights

of man, is on the whole, superior to the genius of the Roman law, based on the rights of property. It is well known that the law of the Pentateuch permitted a man to go into another man's orchard and to take as much fruit as he needed for the appeasing of his hunger. He could eat as much as he liked, but he was not allowed to carry any fruit away. Furthermore, the laws which gave the poor the right to go into the fields and reap the corners, to glean after the reapers, &c., is not a law of charity, strictly speaking, but a law of justice, recognizing the right of a man to the means of a livelihood, the right to work at all events, to pick up in the fields what he needs for his subsistence. It is quite evident that here we have an expression of the superiority of the rights of men to the rights of property. Having mentioned the heritage that comes from Greece and Rome, we have lastly the heritage of Jesus—'the most important vision of all times'.

Who are the heirs to whom this inheritance is to be turned over? In the first place, it is the chaos of nations around the Mediterranean—these are brutalized races, according to Chamberlain, degraded mestizos, people, therefore, without purity, nationality, character, originality. They will lend themselves well for the building up of an empire in which nationality is destroyed, and for the mixing of all sorts of ideas and systems. They are the material for all sorts of syncretisms. Christians will not relish the following statement of Mr. Chamberlain, vol. I, p. 252: 'All foundations for historical Christianity were laid and built up by this mongrel population.' Secondly, there is the Jewish race. It alone, Chamberlain says, possessed at the time physiognomy and character, although later he will call it a bastard race. 'They were the only

people at that time', he holds, 'deserving of respect. They had faith in self.' 'Since this faith included faith in a higher being, it did not lack ethical significance.' The law 'however poor', was good in an age of lawlessness. 'Here, as elsewhere, we shall find that the influence of the Jews for good and for evil lies in their character, not in their intellectual achievements.'

If we understand the meaning of 'character' with all its implications, we can well take this as a tribute. These are the examples of the things that he says about the Jew, that escape Chamberlain in spite of himself. In connexion with this ability of the Jew to maintain a physiognomy and character in a time of universal chaos, I would say it is because the Jew had faith in himself, he did not accept Jesus, as the early Church made him, the centre of its life, and did not thus lose himself in this chaotic world. The last heir to enter upon the scene of history is the Germanic race. These three heirs, chaos of nations, the Jew, and the Germanic race, waged the fight.

The fight is within religion for Germanic Aryan ideas, according to Chamberlain, as against dogmas and superstitions. And in the State, for race, nationality, and freedom, as against empire and universalism. The curse of the Germanic race, according to him, consisted in this, that it got the heritage Christianity, as a result of the marriage of Aryan mythology, which he likes very much, with what he calls, Jewish chronistic, historic, dogmatic, abstract materialism. In passing, we may say, that dogma was altogether foreign to the Jew, and he cannot at all be made responsible for the dogmatic formulation of myths in what came to be the content of the faith of the Church. The Germanic element is always hoping, according to the author,

to disengage the symbolic value of the Aryan mythology and adding to it, by its creative effort, from the Jewish and ecclesiastical elements. According to him, if you touch mythology and destroy it, you land in Judaism. And if you retain the historic dogma, you Judaize the world. Therefore, from Paul through Augustine to Luther and to-day, there runs a contradiction through Christianity. There is dogma and superstition and chronology on the one hand and there is the life of Jesus, the Aryan myths—like Trinity and Incarnation and the conception of the inwardness of religion, as expressed in the ideas of faith, grace, as opposed to works, on the other hand. Organized Christianity is for him a hybrid.

Let us now take up this conception of Christianity and Judaism somewhat more in detail. There is nothing to say with respect to his glorification of Jesus. Jesus is for him more than man. He quotes approvingly the line from Diderot: 'This was not a philosopher, it was a God.' This is the expression of Chamberlain's faith, and faith, sincerely held, should always be met with reverence and not with argument. Only when it seeks to force itself upon others, does it expose itself to the just criticism of an analytical reason. For him, Jesus is the invisible made visible. As a favourite phrase of his, which occurs often in the book, has it, we would say Jesus presents God, as it were 'sub specie oculorum'. But when he talks of Jesus as a man and begins to analyse and appraise what was original in him, and what was opposed to and different from his being, we must have more to say than our space will allow. He has a very fanciful conception of Jesus. He tears him, in his essence, entirely out of Jewish history. He sees in him merely a transcendental idealist. He com-

pares him later to the philosopher Kant. What Kant did for philosophy, that Jesus did for religion. The substance of the teaching of Jesus is for him in the phrase 'the Kingdom of God is within you'. Although even this phrase, which runs all through his book as the very watchword and characteristic differentiation of the new revelation, and which is supposed to separate it by an unbridgeable chasm from Judaism, has, as a matter of fact, been taken by scholars to mean, according to the Greek original, 'the Kingdom is in your midst'. This, of course, is quite a different conception, and really means the Messianic Hope is already fulfilled. 'The Kingdom is already now, here on earth and I am its inaugurator', an entirely different proposition indeed from the transcendentalism which Chamberlain would see in the phrase: It is the claim that what Judaism hoped for has at last been realized. It is indeed, to speak in Chamberlain's phraseology, itself a piece of Jewish historic thought which can be disputed or argued about. Only Jesus, that is the impression we get, revealed the mysteries, which cannot be expressed in words. Only *he* taught the religion of the heart, of which, according to the author's thesis, Judaism knew nothing. Next to the phrase 'the Kingdom of God', Chamberlain emphasizes the method of Jesus. He calls it 'a conversion of the will'—'For I am meek and lowly of heart, learn of me.' Parenthetically, we would here say, this is just what separates Judaism from Christianity. Judaism permits no mortal thus to speak. The meekness of a man must be attested of him by others. The Prophetic message was always 'learn of God through me'. The Jewish Prophets reveal a law higher than themselves. They do not claim to be the concrete illustration of it which is to be imitated.



The greatness of Moses consisted in the fact that he was called meek by others. The duration of his creation, a people consecrated to God, resulted from the fact, that through his own teaching he became overshadowed by the God whose instrument he was. Jesus, according to Chamberlain, is not only the centre, but the essence, the substance of the new revelation. They therefore called him, he says, 'tree of life', 'the bread of life', 'the light of life', 'the foundation', and so forth. Jesus, he emphasizes, did not preach, like Buddha, obedience, chastity, purity. He did not deny the will to live which the Aryan Schopenhauer in the nineteenth century taught again, after his Hindu cousin. Jesus affirmed the will to live. But his 'conversion' is a war against the inner spirit of mankind, against the motives which underlie their action. He brought a 'sword' against the world's life. Chamberlain emphasizes what he calls, 'his sublime pride'. He turns the cheek, not only for the weak humanitarian's sake, but for his own sake. It is not merely the stoical self-control. It was an expression of his own way of living. 'Father, forgive them, they know not what they do', is for Chamberlain an illustration of that sublime pride. But he forgets the phrase 'My God, why hast thou forsaken me?' This would bring Jesus much nearer to ordinary humanity. It needs but to mention these things to show what a fanciful construction of the personality of Jesus Chamberlain here makes. Much truer is the ordinary conception of the man of Nazareth as a lover of his fellow men, as a sympathizer with their sufferings, as a brother, seeking to do them good, than this idea of a metaphysical transcendentalist, who turns away the will from the ordinary motives of men.

With Jesus, according to Chamberlain, begins the moral

awakening of man: 'Man rose against his animal nature', &c. This is certainly a sweeping statement and can only be explained by the completely artificial method, which the author employs to separate Jesus from the moral experience as embodied in the Jewish consciousness up to his time. When he comes to inquire as to the origins of Jesus and his teaching, he says, 'he was a Jew in religion and education undoubtedly, in race most probably not'. He criticizes Prof. Albert Réville who said that it is idle to discuss the question whether Jesus was of Aryan origin or not, boldly asserting, 'a man belongs to the nation in whose midst he has grown up'. Of such an assertion, Chamberlain says, 'and this was science in 1896!' I would rather be guided by the science of Réville, who has no preconceived thesis to maintain, than by the dogmatic speculations of our author. He becomes even more emphatic and says, 'whoever makes the assertion, Christ is a Jew, is either ignorant or insincere'. In order to make out that Jesus was no Jew, he contradicts himself in a twofold way. In the first place, in a relatively superficial way. On p. 203 of the first volume, he is talking of Galilee where Jesus was born and where lived a mixture of nations, and he says 'only political connexion, not community of religious faith, fosters fusion of races'. As Galilee was separated politically from Judea, this is to intimate the possibility that Jesus had no Jewish blood in his veins, though he was brought up in the Jewish religion. On p. 212, of the same volume, he tells us 'the very conversion to the Jewish faith gradually obliterated differences'. If the conversion to the Jewish faith, which according to the Jewish law, a law in existence now for over two thousand years, permitted marriage between Jews and non-Jewish races, obliterated differences,

then religion is more than political connexion as a factor in favouring the fusion of races and this is a contradiction of what he had said. But there is even a deeper contradiction than this. If Jesus is a Jew in religion and education, nay, if, as he is depicted, even his originality differentiating him from Buddha, he manifests Jewish and Semitic peculiarity, he is completely a Jew, according to Chamberlain's theory, by race. The favourite idea of Chamberlain, upon which he insists all through his book, is that of the *plis de pensée*, that is to say, the fold of the thought of a man is given to him by his race. However original he may be, he cannot emancipate himself from the groove, from the mould, from the category, by which his thought is shaped and which are given him, as it were, by his blood. Now, in order to separate Jesus from the Jews, he makes Jesus the negation of the Jewish religion. He conceives the Jew as the most irreligious of peoples. Judaism, it is true, is the framework for Jesus's religion; but it is the negative background upon which his positive message rises. The Semite and Jew, he tells us, in another connexion, are characterized by two things, great strength of will and the chronistic, historic view of religion. But we have just been told, Jesus emphasizes above all things, the will. It is the centre in all his teachings. In fact, his whole gospel is an affirmation of the will to live, but a conversion of it, radically departing from the ordinary motives of human nature. And on p. 246, we are told 'Christ is a Jew in so far as he believes in Divine Almightyness, in Divine Providence, in freedom of the human mind, in exclusive emphasis of the moral nature of men and in the equality of men before God'. Freedom, too, is for Chamberlain a Jewish conception as opposed to the Aryan, which

emphasizes necessity. Now, if there is anything in *plis de pensée* at all, this stamps Jesus as a Jew in race, as well as a Jew in religion. For even the transcendentalist, the revealer of the 'Kingdom within you', to speak with Chamberlain, cannot emancipate himself from the fundamental ways of thinking which, according to our author, are characteristic of the Semitic race, if there be such a thing, and above all, of the concrete things, Jew and Judaism. Thus we see in what practically absurd contradictions Chamberlain involves himself, because of his fanatical determination to separate the man he worships as divine, as the revealer of absolute religion, from the people whom he hates and whose genius he considers most antipathetic to his own Germanic consciousness. The life of Jesus, according to Chamberlain, is the main thing. This is Christianity for him. But he tears it apart, not only from everything Jewish, but also from everything that follows it in history. This is most unscientific and unhistorical. Organized Christianity is for him a departure in the main from that life. It is made up of three things: the Aryan myths, trinity, incarnation, &c., which he likes, as long as they remain myths and are not crystallized into dogmas and grace, faith, everything of an inner spiritual nature. And secondly, the scholasticism, the mysteries, the soul-cult, which came to it from Greece, and lastly, the inheritance from the mestizos, the hybrid nations, their idolatries, their conception of mother of God; from Semitism, the conception of will; from Judaism, chronology, universalism, priestly character. Rome, the great world power, organized Christianity as a hybrid mixture of these three elements, and the result is, according to him, dogma, intolerance, absolutism, and a tremendous mass of superstitions. His

idea is, therefore, that Judaism is in great measure responsible for this hybrid. As a matter of fact, as we shall see, Judaism is not responsible for its dogma, nor for its priestly character, nor, as he himself admits, for its superstitions, nor even for its desire for universal rule. On the contrary. Had Jewish ideas been adopted by the world in their purity and adapted to the various needs of varying nationalities, these consequences, which are so disastrous in the eyes of Chamberlain, would not have followed.

His view of Judaism is not flattering, and is altogether based upon the most surprising ignorance. He has no knowledge of sources, no first-hand acquaintance with it. He follows slavishly the Biblical critics and their pupils. The Jew he calls a bastard race. And he explains the whole process of Jewish development up to Jesus, by the set formula with respect to Jewish law, which he repeats from his Christian theological authorities. There is nothing new in this caricature of Judaism which he presents to us. He repeats old and well-worn phrases. Our religion, he tells us, is based on fear. If he wishes to prove that there is no love in the Jewish religion, he cites a passage from the description of the conquest of Palestine. But he does not even mention that there is such a sentence as 'Love thy neighbour as thyself', in the nineteenth chapter of Leviticus, and that the Torah, lest there be any mistake in the matter, added 'And thou shalt love the stranger as thyself'. According to him, the Jewish religion simply means external observance, which is to be rewarded by a world empire. So he interprets the Messianic idea. There is no mysticism, no real faith, no heart in the Jewish religion. Whatever faith there is, is a maximum of faith in self which is merely the expression of the intense will.

There is a minimum of religion. The Jews are not at all monotheistic, because monotheism is the result of intellectual activity. This caricature of religion, according to him, came about in this way: First, the best elements in Israel were eliminated in the transportation and destruction of the tribes of the Northern kingdom. These are to him the noblest elements in Israel. It is interesting to observe that an anti-Semite always praises a dead Jew. Our crime is that we are still on the scene to be reckoned with. A second factor in the bringing about of the result which he describes, is the wonderful survival of Judah for 120 years after Jerusalem had been threatened with destruction by Assyria. This gave the prophets great power and accustomed the people to believe in the invincibleness of their God. A third factor was that Judah was torn out of its soil and transplanted to Babylon where it broke with the old national traditions. A fourth was the return of a small number, and lastly, the work of Ezra and Nehemiah who, in his opinion, imposed upon the people a law which they really did not want. Thus, by a process of elimination, there was produced Jew and Judaism—something that has little religion, but great intensity of will, that makes slaves, trembling to obey the law of the arbitrary master, who will give them as their reward the eventual mastery of the world. This is Chamberlain's wretched picture of the Jewish religion.

With respect to the charges that Judaism is responsible for the dogma, superstitions, priestly power, and the will to universal rule, which appear in organized Christianity, we must say that Chamberlain is an excellent example of the man in history, who would eat his cake and at the same time have it. The troubles in Christianity followed, in our

opinion, from the central fact which our author holds up to admiration. For him, religion is best expressed in the transcendental myth. But myth becomes a very dangerous thing when you make it the centre of a system. Its tendency is, inasmuch as there is always something intellectual in it, to crystallize into a hard dogma. When that which should remain invisible, is made visible in the form of a myth, in the form of a divine life, the trouble begins. In religion, the image worship, against which Chamberlain thunders, is the result of the idea of a God that can be seen. If once God walked upon earth in the form of a man, it is but natural that images of that man should be made and tenderly cherished. It is the popular way of expressing, what seems to Chamberlain the great virtue of non-Jewish religion, seeing things 'under the aspect of the eyes'.

Chamberlain even makes negro religion superior to the Jewish religion, because the African negroes could form myths. It was, we hold, the deliberate repression of myth by the Jewish genius that prevented the things which fill our author with so much horror. Dogma, which plays such a rôle in the organized Christianity, which our author is constantly attacking, is the result of the very thing which he criticizes Judaism for lacking. It is the result, namely, of so-called intellectual activity. It is the expression in religion of metaphysics as overshadowing ethics. Superstition is the result of giving up the law. Chamberlain himself admits that if Rome had taken the pure spirit of Judaism, which was 'opposed to all forms of superstition', instead of mixing it with other elements, so much mischief would not have resulted. Such an admission, as dozens of others which we have seen, brings unconscious tribute to

Judaism, contradicts the substance of his thesis. It is a violent misinterpretation of Jewish history, to make Judaism responsible for the hierarchic power which entered Christendom. By so doing, Chamberlain betrays his extreme superficial knowledge of Jew and Judaism. The Priest and Temple, it is true, were still in existence at the beginning of the Christian Era. The pomp of ritual and sacrifice was there, but it had already become, as compared with the real forces that were shaping the Synagogue, an empty shell. When the facts of history put an end to them, Judaism could survive. But the vicarious sacrifice, which, as we have seen above, Chamberlain denounces, was taken up by organized Christianity as a central dogma, and the priest that administered the rite became again the central figure and mediator. In Judaism, long before the destruction of the Temple with its sacrificial rites, the Priest had already become subordinated to the scholar, to the teacher, to the real leaders of the people—the Pharisees. The Synagogue was not at all a priestly institution. The Synagogue was an institution governed by learned men and teachers of the law. It was an essentially democratic institution, where only learning and character gave position and authority. And every Israelite in his own home had an altar unto God. Life became sanctified by the prayer, by the benedictions, by the rites and observances which the Pharisaic teachers created. Far from depending on a hierarchy, far from depending for salvation upon a Priest, every Israelite was made free and independent and was taught to worship God directly, without a mediator, by obeying His law and by making life holy. It is a mistake on the part of Chamberlain—if not something worse—to make it appear that Israel thirsted for world empire. Israel, as we shall



see, had indeed a great hope, which embraced all the nations of the world, but it was not intolerant, as Chamberlain intimates. It was conscious, it is true, of the necessity to maintain its own individuality. It refused to lose itself, to use Chamberlain's phrase, in the 'chaos of the nations' of the time. It felt itself called upon to be the light of the Gentiles, the religious educator of the world. But it did not condemn the world for not becoming converted to Judaism. According to Rabbinical teaching, the Gentiles earn salvation, if they observe what is called 'the commandments of Noah'. And these are the simple fundamentals of morality, justice, and order, upon which civilized society rests. In other words, not starting out with the conception of one road to salvation, as indicated once for all by one personality, Judaism did not have the motive which would impel it either to convert the world or to condemn the world refusing conversion. It was wise enough to know and to recognize the light of nature as it shone in the lives of nations. It was quite conscious of its own unique mission, but it could afford to wait. It did aim at universality, but this hope of the triumph of Israel's faith was a purely spiritual thing. It did believe that the nations would some time come to the mountain of the Lord and learn of His ways.

With respect to Chamberlain's view of Jesus, we have already intimated that it is highly fanciful. But as he himself admits Jesus was a Jew in his education, we must say that in his ethics, Jesus teaches nothing that is absolutely new, or cannot be found in the Judaism of his time, as expressed in the Bible or in early Rabbinic teachings. All one needs to do is to read Isaac H. Weiss's *History of Jewish Tradition*, or the summary of it, as given by

Prof. Schechter in his first volume of *Studies in Judaism*, to see the complete parallel between much of the ethical teaching ascribed to Jesus and the Pharisaic inwardness, insistence upon purity of motive and deepening of the law. But there is in Jesus, let us say with Chamberlain, because of his transcendentalism, an ascetic tendency. 'The conversion of the will', which overthrows ordinary motives of men with which civilization is built up, may lead to peculiar results. And in this, as in many things already noticed, you cannot tear the consequences altogether away from the premisses. It is easy for Chamberlain to say, in comparing Jesus with Buddha, 'Jesus did not teach poverty, chastity, and obedience', but rather affirmed the will to live. Nevertheless, there was a germ in Jesus's teaching which made it very easy for men to interpret it as leading to the flight from the world's temptations and to the denial of its worth. That 'sublime pride', upon which Chamberlain insists, which makes Jesus turn the other cheek, which would absolutely refuse to employ force or civil institutions to establish right or justice, can very logically lead and has led to the doctrine of non-resistance to evil. In Judaism, the duty of forgiving in personal relations, is emphasized most clearly: 'Thou shalt not bear a grudge against the children of thy people.' But, on the other hand, it is our duty to obtain justice for oneself and for others. The personal relation and the social duty are distinguished and expressed in different precepts. That the influence of Jesus in the direction of denying the use of social institutions for the expression and enforcing of moral ideas still persists, can be seen in the fact that such a great spirit as Tolstoi, whom every one would speak of with reverence, has actually interpreted the Christianity of the

gospel to be a denial of the whole structure of civil authority and its penal machinery and institutions. He has, in a word, identified the gospel with philosophical anarchism, and has seen in non-resistance to evil the very essence of Jesus's message. There was therefore, in the teaching of Jesus an element, which naturally was not only not in accord with Jewish ethics, but is incapable of being utilized for the building up of human society. What Chamberlain does not emphasize and what is very important, is the fact that Jesus saw in himself the Messiah, and thereby he makes a break with Judaism as a religion.

What is the essence of the Jewish Messianic hope? Its formulation varies according to the needs of the time. At one time, the Messiah is conceived as an ideal King. At another time, he is imagined as a transcendental apocalyptic figure. But the essence of the Messianic Hope consists in its being a wistful looking to the future. It is one thing to hope for a Messiah; it is quite another thing for a man to say, *I am the Messiah*. The realization puts an end to the hope, because of its presumed fulfilment, but at the same time destroys its value as an impelling ideal. Now, the essence of Jewish hope consists in its ideal character, and therefore, the Jew, Catholic Israel, has thus far never recognized any individual concrete Messiah that claimed its homage, because the Hope is greater than any man. When Jesus, therefore, was filled with the consciousness of being the Messiah, he could not possibly have been so acknowledged by the Jew. But any organized religion that based itself on that claim, naturally assumed that all hopes had been realized and a new world empire had begun. Here, again, the claim to world empire does not come from Judaism but from the central fact in organized Christianity.

Judaism still says, The Kingdom of God is partly in the present, but its full realization will be in the future. It looks not to the past, but to what will be. It cherishes the ideal, but refuses to recognize the full realization of it in any present condition or event. Jewish Messianism, quick to hope and hard to satisfy, is the essence of Jewish idealism.

If our author fails to understand the spiritual power of the Jewish Messianic idea, which is natural on his part, because only those who hold an idea can thoroughly understand it, and if he identifies it most unhistorically with a sort of political hunger for world-dominion, it is not to be wondered at that he does not understand our religion at all, and with his simple mechanical formula fails to penetrate to the spirit of the 'Torah'—usually translated by 'law', but embracing much more than law.

What is our Torah? What is the Law, which the Christian theologians, in their rôle of Bible critics, and Chamberlain, their follower, dispose of in one formula? As a matter of fact, it is a summary of the many elements that go to make up the many-sidedness of Jewish religion. It is an appeal to many sides of human nature. In it, there is not only law, but the element of prophecy. There is even mysticism and also myth in the profound sense of the word. Chamberlain never gives a clear definition of what he understands by religion. Sometimes, it appears that it is for him synonymous with myth. At another time, it is metaphysics. We should venture to define religion as the life of the soul in the presence of God. It is not merely feeling, nor is it an intellectual conception, nor is it merely deed, but it is the whole life of man, permeated with the consciousness of Another, God a Greater

than man. The Jewish religion represents a maximum of faith. Not faith in the sense in which Chamberlain uses it, as faith in one's own will, but faith in the sense of conviction as to the reality of the one God, who cannot be exhaustively defined and should not be imaged. Such an intensity of faith the Jew had and he combined that intensity with a minimum of credulity, which kept his mind free and saved him from superstition, as Chamberlain himself admits. Thus the Jew was religious and rationalist at the same time. The Jew has an intense conviction as to God. He wins God by an intuition, not by an argumentation or metaphysical speculation. This intuition is to him revelation. He deliberately runs away from myth. He retains some myths that have a profound significance for thought and are richly suggestive in ethical inspiration. But the myth remains with him free, relatively isolated, subordinated. It does not become the centre of his religious life. At best, in its subordinate function, it is an illustration of truth. What the Jew does emphasize in religion is deed, action, ethics, law, duty. And is this not what the modern man is aiming at? Far from making myth the most important thing in religion, the modern man puts into subordinate position the intellectual element in religion and emphasizes the practical and the ethical. The Jewish religion thus anticipated by intuition, or theologically speaking, by revelation, what the modern man has arrived at, as a result of centuries of development. Modern religion finds myth, as crystallized into dogma, a stumbling-block. Judaism has long ago discovered this. The Jew, in his system of religious life, is governed by two great tendencies: the Halakah, or Law, and the Haggadah, literally, that which is told, and this includes everything outside of the law.

These two tendencies, brought out clearly in the Talmudic and Rabbinic literature, are, we may say, anticipated in the Torah itself. The Torah has its Haggadic element. The Jew puts all his myths into Haggadah, which is considered the free, untrammelled, spontaneous expression of the individual. The Halakah, or law, rules life. We, of course, cannot carry out this thought in detail here. Suffice it to say, that the Jew never was without the opportunity to express, in the form of myth or legend, truths and beliefs about divinity. But such expressions were deliberately left without authority. The Jewish religion, therefore, does not put creed or theology in its centre, but rather the ethical ideal and the law for the daily life. The myth of the Torah is left, as it were, in silence. No consequences are drawn from it. No dogmas are built up upon it. It stands there isolated, a relic of the individual insight and poetic conception, overawed by the demands of the higher revelation, as it grasps the thought of the one spiritual God, who cannot be imaged or portrayed, and by the law of life which this God reveals.

The Jewish religion recognizes the creative power of personalities, but its distinctive character consists in this, that it makes principle superior to personality. Not man is to be worshipped, but the Eternal who speaks through him, and the law, which is greater than he. The Jew's religion is a way of life, not given for all by a man, but expressed in a categorical imperative, which is greater than and binding upon all men. The Jewish religion is not without inwardness. All the conceptions which Chamberlain praises so much, such as grace, sense of sin, God's pardon, the love of God in the heart, faith—all

these things are part of the Jewish religious view of God's dealings with men. They are present in the Bible, they are richly developed in the Talmudic literature, they do not become the centre of the system, because the centre is always the ethical demand upon life. Man is assumed as capable of obeying the law. God, as the Talmud has it, looks to the heart. If man has done the best he can, he need not fear for his salvation. And yet, though the capacity for obeying the ethical command is assumed, the grace of God is prayed for and acknowledged as indispensable. And a Rabbi in the Talmud sums up the whole significance of the law by formulating it in one principle, quoting the Prophet's saying, 'the righteous liveth by his faith'. Judaism, feeling the infinity of God, did not attempt to formulate Him in concise, clear-cut theological dogmas. It spoke of Him according to the feeling and mood which may predominate in the soul of man. God is indeed for the Jew, at one time, the sublime uncompromising Law-Giver, insisting upon obedience, and at another time, the gracious, atoning, forgiving, loving Father. The Jew, therefore, lacked nothing of the inwardness of religion, of the feeling of communion of the soul with God, of the feeling of unworthiness in the presence of the Perfect. The prayer-book every morning makes the Jew repeat 'What are we, what is our power, what our strength, what is even our righteousness?' It is an entire misunderstanding, if not something worse, of Judaism, to see in it nothing but a law, given externally to men, enforced by fear, imposed upon trembling slaves by an arbitrary master. Judaism taught indeed that men could become free only through the law engraved on the tablets, as this is prettily expressed by a Rabbinical play on the

words *herut* (freedom) and *harut* (engraved). The Jew anticipated the conception of Chamberlain's favourite thinker Kant, by teaching men that moral freedom comes through reverence for law.

To sum up, by illustration, this whole question of the place of the free myth and the deep inwardness in the many-sided Jewish religion, I would call attention to two fragments of Israel's literature, one from the Torah and the other from the Rabbis. In the 33rd chapter of Exodus, from the 17th to the 23rd verses inclusive, we have a sublime example of the working of the mythopoetical power in Israel's consciousness. The great law-giver says to God: 'Show me Thy glory.' 'And He said, I will cause all My goodness to pass before thee, and I will call upon the name of the Lord before thee, and I will be gracious unto whom I will be gracious, and I will show mercy unto whom I will show mercy. And He said; Thou canst not see My face, for no man can see Me and live. And the Lord said, Behold there is a place with Me, and thou shalt take thy place on the rock, and it shall come to pass, when My glory passeth by, I will place thee in the cleft of the rock and I will put My hand upon thee until I pass by, and I will remove My hand, and thou wilt see My back, but My face cannot be seen.' Here we have the conception of the perfect freedom of grace as it comes from God to man. Here we have the idea which is absolute truth, that we only catch a glimpse of Divinity when it is fleeting, that we can never see the face, or grasp the essence of God, that we can only see His back, that is to say, His effects, the traces of His work, of His influence in the universe and in ourselves. Certainly such a God could never be imaged



by art, nor articulated in dogma, nor described fully in myth, nor exhausted in any personality. And the Rabbis very beautifully, in commenting upon this passage, show that they understood the profound significance of it. They make the remark that wherever there are footprints of man in the cleft of the rock, there was a vision of Divinity. When man becomes conscious of himself and of the Greater than he, he realizes the presence of God. That presence is always revealed in effect, never in essence. The back of God we see, but never the face. I should venture to say that such a passage will hold its own for clearness of thought, for chasteness and restraint of speech, for deep religious experience, for poetic beauty, with any myth, the creation of the genius of any other people. And it is immediately after this passage that we are told that the overwhelming revelation comes to the great law-giver, in which he learns the attributes of Divinity, in which God manifests Himself as a God 'merciful and gracious, long-suffering, abundant in love and faithfulness'.

And now, for the passage from Rabbinical literature to prove the deep inwardness of Jewish religion and the utter falsity of Chamberlain and his masters, who give the impression that Judaism could not think soundly upon the questions of sin and grace, transgression and forgiveness. The following is a remarkable passage. We are told, 'Wisdom was asked: "how stands it with the sinner and his penalty?" and the answer came, "evil pursueth the sinner". Prophecy was asked, "what of the sinner and his penalty?" and the answer came, "the sinning soul, it will die". The Torah, or the Law was asked, "what of the sinner and his penalty?" and it said, "let him bring a sin-offering and he will be atoned for". Finally, God was

asked, "what of the sinner and his penalty?" and He answered, "let him turn away from his sin and he will be forgiven".<sup>1</sup> The man that left us this fragment certainly understood the spirit of the Torah, and we have in it the complete thought of Judaism. Sin, from one point of view is a transgression of law, whose consequences are evil and suffering. That is a truth, but it is an external truth. Sin, from another point of view, is death, literally, spiritual death. This is the truth grasped from the intuitional point of view. In the Prophetic conscience, there is an absolute chasm between good and evil. The tragedy of sin does not consist so much in its consequences of suffering, as in its essence of a fall from the ideal and the ensuing spiritual death. How shall man rise above the effects of sin in himself? From the point of view of the Torah, that is to say, from the point of view of practical religion as it governs men and impresses their imagination, man should express his regret and sincere repentance by some external symbolic act. He should *do* something. He should bring an offering. He should make an atonement, as the first-fruits of his change of heart. There must be action. And indeed, ceremonial action in religion is not to be despised. It is the specific way in which the religious life expresses itself. The action expresses the feeling, and, conversely, the external deed reacts on the feeling, intensifies it and makes it a permanent influence. Now comes the climax. After all is said and done, the deepest truth about sin refers to the relation of the human soul to God. And God is made to give the simplest possible answer. 'Let the sinner but turn from his way', let there be a genuine conversion of the heart and will and the sinner need not despair. Life begins for him anew, fresh, with

new hope and joy. If the sinner turns, God will forgive, because God is Perfect Love and Grace. In the climax, we hear no more of consequences, of the terrible significance of sin, of the value of ritual and symbol as aids. We have reached the 'holy of holies' of the inwardness of the relation of the human soul, the child to God, its Father in heaven. Such a passage, once for all, should shut the mouths of those who ignorantly babble about the lack of inwardness in Judaism.

We hold, therefore, that Judaism is not responsible for the dogma or the superstition or anything else that fills Chamberlain with so much horror and disgust in what he calls the hybrid of historical Christianity. It is not our business here to give any opinion on the religion of Christendom. We are simply trying to analyse Chamberlain's conceptions and showing their utter untenableness, as far as the Jew and Judaism are concerned, because they rest on either an ignorant or a wilful misunderstanding of the Jewish spirit. And if we have proved such misunderstandings, and if we have, though ever so inadequately, given some true glimpses of Judaism, as a moral and spiritual power in the world, we have vindicated the creative power of Jewish genius and we have shown that in Jewish religiosity at its best, the Western World finds that spiritual culture which has fructified it and without which it cannot do. If the nations had adopted Judaism in its purity, they would have had a different development. They would have adapted its laws to their own circumstances, even as Israel kept constantly adapting its own law, through the moulding and shaping force of tradition, or what is called the oral law. For Judaism was never bibliolatrous. The letter

did not constrain, contrary to the usual assumption. And the nations would have saved themselves from mysteries and myths made dogmas, from the materialization of religion. They would have put into the centre of their religious consciousness, the conception of the moral ideal governing human life. The Jew did not lose himself in the 'chaos'. He did not abdicate his mission. That is why the Jew waits. He has a conception of humanity in which he believes, but humanity for him does not mean the obliteration of strong nationalities or personalities, but rather their education. The union of the world for him, was not pre-figured by the sway of a universal dogma based on a scheme of salvation, but by a union of peoples, recognizing the world's God and seeking to learn of His law. If we look at race, as laymen, even as Chamberlain professes to do, we shall not minimize its influence, but at the same time, we shall not magnify it. Idea, we hold, is greater than race. Race is plastic and capable of being influenced by ideas. Otherwise, we would have to believe in a fatalism which would prevent the hope in education. The Jews and Judaism did *believe* in humanity and progress. We take no such pessimistic view as does Chamberlain, that progress is limited only to individuals and to certain races. And we do not consider 'humanity' merely an abstraction. We hold that the Biblical conception of man being made in the image of God, puts the ideal, as is proper to the religious point of view, in the beginning. What Chamberlain treats with contempt, the chronistic, the historic view of Judaism, has sublime aspect. To be paradoxical, I would say, that is the peculiarly distinctive way in which the Jewish mythical faculty expresses itself. The goal of the human race is anticipated by the Jewish

religious genius, and made to appear as the driving idea of history from the very beginning. Potentially, humanity begins as one. Actually, it will become one, when it is completely educated and perfected. The essence of the Messianic hope is this,—education, progress, and perfection. Not for one race, but for all races and for all men.

We Jews must emphasize religion and not our race. I differ very much with Felsenthal and other Zionists, whom our author quotes with approval. Our religion is not as Felsenthal has it, an 'accident' in the philosophical sense. It is substance. It made the Jew what he is. It is not only one side of the Jewish consciousness, which he may drop or not, as he chooses. It is the whole thing about the Jew. Our nationalists take the stand of Chamberlain. We are, however, not a nation in the usual sense of the word. We are God's people, and can belong to any people, and co-operate for that people. Chamberlain himself says the Jewish nation is only an idea and a hope. But this idea makes Jewish individuality. The idea transcends ordinary nationality. The Jew is the servant of this idea. He, as one of our prophets put it, is the servant of the Eternal. And this idea is Jewish culture, this idea is Jewish life. And, strictly speaking, a Jew without a God and without consciousness of service to Him, has ceased to be a Jew in spirit. With the Jew, God is always the centre. Chamberlain, correctly, as in so many other instances, gets at this thought when he says in a note, 'Jews are either theists or atheists'. 'With us *Germanen*', he says, 'the centre is either the mother of God, or the Redeemer.' In this statement, Chamberlain, of course, wants to point out how quickly the transition may be for the Jew from theism to atheism

Once he departs from the invisible spiritual God, he may lapse into atheistic denial, because he has nothing which shall present to him the Eternal 'sub specie oculorum', to make it visible for him. Chamberlain would argue from this that the Jew is poor in religion. I hold that this is the great, even if difficult, privilege of the Jew that he is called upon to live on the heights of a *faith, which is to cling to the God that cannot be seen*. Chamberlain is right in his understanding that for a Jew, God must be the centre of his thought, or his Jewish consciousness is lost.

We have made a rather lengthy examination of this brilliant though bigoted and prejudiced work, and yet, we could not possibly, within the space at our command, do full justice to the theme. We have, however, attempted to show, and hope that we have been successful in showing, the peculiar psychology which made Chamberlain write this book. Chamberlain dislikes the Semite, and above all, the concrete neighbour, the Jew. He feels in the depths of his being that what is best in the religious consciousness of the Western World came from a Jew. He admits that the Western World, and what he is most interested in, the Germanic world, has thus far not been creative in religion. If our analysis has any measure of truth, we would say, the Teutons need Jewish religious culture very much. In fact, they are still living by the best that Jews gave them. Let not Chamberlain be afraid. He likes 'love' better than 'fear' in religion. Judaism has place both for fear of God and for love of God. A great German, Bismarck, said: 'Wir Deutsche fürchten Gott, sonst keinen.' 'We Germans fear God and no one else.' All great men knew what 'fearing God' meant.

You can love Him, but you must not get too familiar with Him. Your place is on your knees in reverence before Him and the majesty of His Law. But while Chamberlain likes 'love', let him not do a great injustice to his great Germanic people by preaching a gospel such as this whole book, the essence of which would practically amount to the following war-cry: 'Wir Germanen lieben uns selbst, sonst keinen.' 'We Teutons love ourselves, but no one else.' One can admit the greatness of the Germanic peoples—what they did for the world. One need not disparage the greatness of the Jewish genius and what *it* did for the world. I profoundly believe that there is not only great opportunity, but great necessity for the harmonious co-operation of Jewish religious and ethical genius with Germanic creative power for the progress and benefit of humanity. Chamberlain has done his people a great injustice. They are, on the whole, much broader-minded than he. The Jewish conception is that of a self-conscious obligation to serve the Eternal. Israel's distinction is that of duty. It feels itself to be at the centre of human history, placed there by Divine Providence. But it has a message of love and appreciation for all peoples and it despises none.